ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE*: ATTACK ON TWO MEMBERS OF BORDER COMMITTEE BY KANNADIGAS AT BHALKI.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Inview of this, I disallow it. Sri B. R. Sunthankar has given notice of an adjournment motion and it is as follows :—

> "The House do stand adjourned to discuss the deliberate attack on Sri H. V. Pataskar, Governor of Madhya Pradesh and Sri M. D. Bhat, the two representatives of the Maharashtra Government on Maharashtra-Mysore Border Dispute Mediation Committee, made by the Kannadigas with stones and sticks after barricading the road and staging violent demonstrations at Bhalki on 21st April 1961, when the two members of the Committee visited Bhalki in their tour of the disputed border areas and also to discuss the failure of the Government to avert the occurrence of the incident and maintain law and order."

†Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—The Hon'ble Member Sri Sunthankar yesterday tabled the adjournment motion. Before I explained about the incident which had happened at Bhalki, I want to make it clear and read the agreement which has been entered into by the Government of Mysore and the Government of Maharashtra so that the Members of this Hon'ble House will exactly know what it is. Sir, it was agreed that the Government of Maharashtra and the Government of Mysore should appoint two representatives from each State to study and discuss together in detail the cases put forward by the two Governments and report to the Governments as to what extent there is a agreement and disagreement about the disputed borders with reasons therefor and that the entire report should be sent to the two Government which should consider the report and taken such action as they deem fit. This was the agreement entered into by the two Governments. As per this agreement one meeting was held where the governor comes from, that is, Madhya Pradesh. The second meeting was held in Bangalore on 24th March 1961. At that time, I had an occasion to meet the members of the Border Committee. I explained to the Members of the Border Committee that it may not be necessary for them to go to the border area and hear representations because the duty cast on the members of the Border Committee is to study the two cases prepared by the Governments and to give their report agreeing or disagreeing with reasons. But some of the Members expressed their desire that in order to study the report it is necessary for them to see the area if possible. So, I suggested to them : "if it is necessary for you to see the area and study the problem, you can go as individual members and not as a Committee." They agreed to that and they went there. Necessary arrangements were made for the Governor and the Party and all the Members in the respective areas wherever they wanted to go. The officers, highest officers in those areas were asked to receive the Governor and the other people and to keep proper bundobust. Then as per the correspondence between the two members coming from Maharashtra, they informed that they wanted to visit

Nippani on 18th April 1961. They visited Nippani and thew the area. Nothing happened there.

Afterwards on 20th April 1961 the Hon'ble Sri Pataskar and Sri Bhat visited Aland in Gulbarga District. On 21st April 1961 they visited Bidar District. Then they went to Bhalki area. Here adequate police bandobust arrangements were made with M.A.R.P and local police under the guidance of the District Superintendent of Police, Bidar. At Bhalki it was reported to the police that there were some persons who wanted to show black flags. For that reason the police were alert and they had taken proper precautionary measures. On that day the black flag demonstrators were condoned off by the police while the car was passing in that area. In that car Sri Bhat and Sri Pataskar were there. The Deputy Commissioner also was there in the car. Some stones were thrown from behind. It was not noticed by the police. As soon as it was noticed by the police, immediately they caught hold of the persons and a case No. 47/61 under section 446 of the Indiam Penal Code is registered in Bhalki Police Station against those persons. The total number of persons involved is 6 and I am told that most of them are from the P.S.P.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—Are they from Mysore or Maharashtra ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I am here speaking about Mysore and not Maharashtra.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—To which State do they belong ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I am talking about Mysore State. I have no jurisdiction over Maharashtra State. These demonstrators were from Mysore State. Police bandobust arrangements had been made and precautionary measures also were taken. In spite of that some small incident happened, but there were no injuries to anybody. Similarly one or two stones were thrown on the police van also, but nothing has happened. As usual, Sri Sunthankar wants to make capital out of this case because he is a member of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samithi and he has to do his duty by the Samithi. He thought that this is a proper case for him to make propaganda and he has tried to do it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—In view of the statement made by the Chief Minister I disallow the motion.

(Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR *rose*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I cannot allow him. I have already given the ruling.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—May I say—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This is not fair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He has given notice of a short notice question on this point. Now Sri Srinivasa Shetty will speak.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir,...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No, I cannot allow.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— Sir, may I say...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No, I cannot allow. I have already called upon Sri Srinivasa Shetty. I have already warned the Hon'ble Members Sri Muckannappa and Sri Arumugham and still both of them are standing.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, you must not lose your balance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He is creating trouble in the House often.

† Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—On a point of order. It is not be fitting the dignity of this House for members to stand in their seats when the Speaker gets up to speak. It is not open to any member of this House to stand up and speak when the Speaker is standing and also to cross words with the Chair. I should like to submit that this is not in order and a ruling must be given.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Again I find that Sri Arumugham is standing. I have been noticing in the House for the last 3 or 4 days that Sri Arumugham always rises when the Speaker rises to speak. He must follow the rules of procedure. This conduct is not worthy of an Hon'ble Member of this House. If he again persists in this I have no alternative but to send him out.

† Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, we all know the incident which took place about 1½ years ago. After persistent request from the Hon'ble Members of this House the Government appointed an officer, namely, the Divisional Commissioner, Bangalore, to enquire into this. Government also promised on the floor of this House that after the report was submitted, if Government found it necessary they would appoint a judicial enquiry. Two orders were made appointing two officers and the last officer retired on 27th February. The Government was asked in the beginning of March whether the enquiry was over and whether the report was submitted to Government to which the present Home Minister replied that it was being typed and that it would be submitted within a few days. It is more than a month now since the report is said to have been submitted. We would like to know whether it has been submitted even now, whether Government have examined the report and whether they have come to any conclusion in the matter and whether they propose to hold any judicial inquiry into the matter.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—The Hon'ble Member has just asked the Government whether the report which was to be submitted by the Divisional Commissioner has been submitted. It is a fact that the Divissional Commissioner has submitted his report to Government and the report is with me and I will place it on the table of the House. Government is examining whether the report that is submitted is sufficient and whether it is necessary for the Government to appoint another Committee, a judicial committee. We have not yet examined the report, we are going through it. For the information of this House

I am going to place it on the table of this House so that Hon'ble Members may go through it.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, according to the programme already issued we understood that the House is to go on till the 28th April. You have allotted 4 days for non-official business, but now we here some changes being made. The matter has not come before the Business Advisory Committee. What I want to say is that 4 days were allotted for non-official business. If for any reason you are going to alter this decision, we on this side feel very reluctant to support that move because we find that every time non-official business comes up there is this interference. This business has not been given the proper treatment that it deserves. So we want that this session should go on till the 28th according to the programme that we have already chalked out. I want to know whether the Chief Minister and the Government have come to any decision to change the programme, if so I have something to say on it. I presume the House will go on till the 28th and that non-official business will not be interfered with and that there will be no reduction in the number of days allotted for non-official resolutions.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palyam).—For every 15 days of the session, we are entitled to have two days allotted for non-official business. So for we have had no non-official business taken up. Now we are told that 4 days have been allotted for this business. I do not know what the Speaker is going to do.

†Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—For every fortnight, we must get two days for non-official business. Just to carry on the business, we did not assert our right. Yesterday we were told that a report is in the hands of the Speaker stating that the House would sit till the 28th. But to-day we just hear that tomorrow the House would adjourn and that we are meeting tomorrow in the morning. I do not know why the rights of the members should be curtailed, particularly in regard to non-official business. When we co-operated heartily with the business of the Government, they should also give an opportunity for the members to express their views and carry on the business of the non-official members. So I request through you to reconsider the question and see that at least 4 days are allotted, whatever the difficulties and whatever the inconveniences the Government might be having. I am making the request through you, because you are the custodian of the rights and privileges of the members. Let not the rights of the Hon'ble members of the House be curtailed. So I request you to kindly see that till the 28th, the number of days allotted should not be curtailed. I am sure that you are going to uphold the just cause and see that the rights and privileges of the members are guarded without any infringement either from the Government or from anybody outside. The Speaker must give a very reasonable consideration to the request of the members and